REGISTERED No. M. 4631.

GAZETTE EXTRAORDINARY

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Vol. VII] [No. 36

Trivandrum, Friday, 31st August 1956/15th Chingam 1132.

GOVERNMENT OF TRAVANCORE-COCHIN

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 7617|56|DD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 29th August 1956*

ORDER

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between:

1 Mr. T. R. Rama Subba Iyer, Vadiveeswaram, Nagercoil.
2 Mr. R. Ramakrishna Iyer, Nagercoil.
3 Mrs. S. Valli Ammal, Meenakshipuram, Nagercoil.
4 Mr. A. Venkita Subramonia Iyer, Vadiveeswaram, Nagercoil.
5 Mr. C. Iyyavoo Panicker, Kottar.
6 Mr. S. Thanunatha Iyer, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
7 Mr.K. Venkita Subbu Avadanikal, Suchindram.
8 Mrs. P. Parathi Ammal, Avadani Allom, Licensee No. 1, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
9 Mr. J. E. A. Parira, Quilon.
10 Mr. Mahadeva Iyer, Avadani Allom, Licensee No. 16, Nagercoil.
11 Mr. Esakki Muthu Nadar, Chotta Panikam Therivilla, Thamarakulam P. O.

12 Mrs. S. Krishna Ammal, Suchindram.
13 Mr. D. Thanka Nadar, Puthalom P. O.
14 Mr. Iyamperumal Pillai, Vadiveeswaram, Nagercoil.
15 Smt. A. Chinnammal, Avadani Allom, Licensee No. 11, Vadiveeswaram, Nagercoil.
16 Mr. S. Kesava Iyer, Avadani Allom, Licensee No. 10, Nagercoil.
17 Mr. R. Subramonia Iyer, Avadani Allom, Licensee No. 9, Nagercoil.
18 Mr. S. Subbiah Nadar, Sasthan Koil Villai, Thamarakulam P. O.
19 Mr. Avadanikal Venkitasubbu Iyer, Avadani Allom, Licensee No. 26, Erattai Theruvu, Suchindram.
20 Mr. S. Harihara Iyer, Advocate, Nagercoil.
21 Mr. S. Ganesa Iyer, Vadiveeswaram, Nagercoil.
22 The Secretary, Old Allom Co-operative Society, Thamarakulam.
23 The Manager, Chithambaranatha Nadar Allom, Old Allom Group, Thamarakulam P. O.
24 The Manager, Sankara Moorthi Pillaya Allom, Thamarakulam P. O.
25 Mr. V. A. Swaminatha Pillai, Swaminatha Pillai Allom, Old Allom Group, Nagercoil.
26 The Manager, S. M. K. M. Allom, Nagercoil.
27 The Manager, S. M. G. N. Allom, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
28 The Manager, S. S. Allom Ltd., Nagercoil.
29 The Manager, C. C. G. T. Allom (Company Allom), Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
30 Mr. S. Venkidasala Karayalar, Govalam Allom A Part, Arianaloor Street, Shenkottah.
31 The Manager, Palkulam Allom, Kottaram P. O.
32 The Manager, Thattarippu Allom, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
33 The Manager, Colachel Allom, Colachel P. O.
34 The Manager, Variyoor Allom, Kottaram P. O.
35 The Manager, M. S. Karayalar, Shencottah, (Kovalam B)
36 Sri M. Kumaraswamy Pillai, Puthalam, Licensee No. 1, Theroor, Suchindram P. O.
37 Sri T. V. Ramasubu Iyer, Lessee Puthalam, Licensee No. 2, Vadiveeswaram, Nagercoil.
38 Smt. V. Bhagavathiammal, C|o A. Sivasubramoniam Avl., B. A., B. L., Advocate, Nagercoil, (Puthalam Licensee No. 3)
39 Sri P. Arumugham Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 4, Poomughat Veedu, Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.
40 Sri S. Sivadham Pillai and Others, (Puthalam Licensee No. 5) Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.
41 Smt. V. Varalekshmi Ammal (V. Bagavathi Ammal), Puthalam Licensee No. 6, Eraviputhoor, Eraviputhoor P. O.

42 Sri P. Sona Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 7, Chempakaramanputhoor, Thovala P. O.
43 Smt. K. Kolammal, (Puthalam Licensee No. 8), Thuvarankadu, Boothapandy P. O.
44 Sri S. Adi Kesavaperumal Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 9, East Street, Suchindram, Suchindram P. O.
45 Smt. V. Veerammal, C|o S. Arumugham Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 10, Marungoor, Marungoor P. O.
46 Sri M. Chidambaranathan Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 11 & 32, Eraviputhoor, Eraviputhoor P. O.
47 Smt. B. Muthammal, Puthalam Licensee No. 12, Edalakudy Veedu, Kadukkarai, Azhakiapandipuram P. O.
48 Smt. Bagavathiammal, Puthalam Licensee No. 13, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
49 Sri Chimarasasubramonia Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 14 and 15, West Street, Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.
50 Smt. P. Diripurasundari Ammal, C|o Sri Maharaja Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 16, Nanjinad Colony, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
51 Sri K. Diraviam Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 17 and 29, Nanjinad Colony, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
52 Sri M. Kumara Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 18 and 22, Theroor, Suchindram P. O.
53 Smt. S. Ramalekshmi Ammal, C|o Sri R. Sundaram Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 19, North Street, Thamarakulam, Thamarakulam P. O.
54 Smt. M. Azhaku Lekshmi, C|o U. Kumaraswamy Pillai, North Street, Eraviputhoor, Eraviputhoor P. O. (Puthalam Licensee No. 20).
55 Smt. M. Bagavathi Ammal, Puthalam Licensee No. 21, West Street, Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.
56 Sri R. Sundaram Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 23, North Street, Thamarakulam, Thamarakulam P. O.
57 Smt. P. Sivakami Ammal, Puthalam Licensee No. 24, Esantimangalam, Boothapandi P. O.
58 Smt. V. Saraswathi Ammal, C|o Sri K. Kanakasabapathi Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 25, Eraviputhoor, Eraviputhoor P. O.
59 Smt. P. Sarveswari Ammal, Puthalam Licensee No. 26, Esantimangalam, Boothapandi P. O.
60 Smt. U. Nagammal, C|o M. Chidambarathanu Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 27, Nanjinad Colony, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
61 Smt. V. Veera Lekshmi, (Puthalam Licensee No. 28), Eraviputhoor, Eraviputhoor P. O.
62 Smt. V. Chadayammal, C|o Sri K. Diraviam Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 30, Nanjinad Colony, Ramavarmapuram, Nagercoil.
63 Smt. A. Yumayammal, C|o R. Subramonia Pillai Avl., Puthalam Licensee No. 31, Theroor, Suchindram P. O.

64 Smt. V. Azhagulekshmi Ammal, C|o Sri K. Diraviam Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 33, Nanjinad Colony, Nagercoil.
65 Sri T. Poovan Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 35, Thuvaramcaud, Boothapandy P. O.
66 Sri C. Narayana Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 38, Kurathankara Veedu, Theroor, Suchindram P. O.
67 Sri I. Muthuswamy Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 37, Pumugathoo Veedu, Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.
68 Smt. V. Sivakami Ammal, Puthalam Licensee No. 39, Theroor, Suchindram P. O.
69 Sri T. M. Chidambarathanu Pillai, Puthalam Licensee No. 40 and 48, Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.
70 Smt. Veeralekshmi Kumara Pillai & Others, Puthalam Licensee No. 41, Parakkai, Parakkai P. O.
71 Smt. V. Valliamma & Others, Puthalam Licensee No. 42, Anandapuram, Kadukkarai, Azhakiapandipuram P. O.
72 Smt. V. Kaliamma, Puthalam Licensee No. 43, Anandapuram, Kadukkarai, Azhakiapandipuram P. O.
73 Smt. V. Arumughathammal & Others, Puthalam Licensee No. 44, Azhakiapandipuram, Azhakiapandipuram P. O.
74 Smt. K. Chidambara Vadivu, Puthalam Licensee No. 45, Deresanamcope, Azhakiapandipuram P. O.
75 Smt. K. Velamma & Others, Puthalam Licensee No. 46, Anandapuram, Kadukkarai P. O.
76 Smt. K. Sivakamisundarai & Others, Puthalam Licensee No. 47, Thazhakudy, Thazhakudy P. O.

and the workmen of the above salt pans represented by the South Travancore Salt Factory Workers Union, Puthalam and the South Travancore National Salt Labour Association, Nagercoil in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And whereas in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Trivandrum.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. Joseph,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE

1. What should be the wage rates that should be paid to the different categories of employees engaged in salt alloms?

2. Are the workers entitled to any bonus for the calendar year 1955; If so what it should be?
3. What should be the wages that should be paid to the maistries and drivers employed in the alloms.
4. What should be the handling charges that should be paid to the workers who handle salts from platform to the places where the vehicles of the merchants wait?
5. Should the scheme of Provident Fund be introduced for the benefit of the workers? If so what are its details?
6. Whether the contract system of doing the work of removal by head load of salt from ridges to platforms is vogue in salt alloms should be stopped? If so what should be the working arrangement and wage rates?
7. What should be the wages that should be paid to the watchers in alloms?
8. What are the leave facilities that should be allowed to the workers?
9. Are the workers employed in S. M. G. M. Allom and S. M. K. M. Allom entitled to any arrear leave wages and bonus? If so what it should be?
10. Should the workers or the union be given proper previous information when the managements change the Kangani system of work to maikad system and *vice versa*? If so in what manner?

Labour Department

L. Dis. 21678|56|DD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.*

ORDER

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between Shri S. P. Sankara Iyer, Bus Owner, Alleppey and the workmen of the above person represented by the all Travancore Motor & Mechanical Workers' Congress, Shertallai,

in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this Order,

And, Whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10 (1) (C) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. Joseph,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the discharge of conductors K. V. Satyapalan and Ramankutty from service is justifiable ?

2. To what reliefs are they entitled, if

(a) the discharge is not justifiable &
(b) the discharge is found justifiable.

Labour Department

L. Dis. 20896|56|DD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.*

ORDER

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the management of the Ratnagiri Estate, Konney and the workmen of the above estate represented by the Estates Staffs Union of South India, Kottayam in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10 (1) (C) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,
V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE

Whether the pay and allowances, if any, of the following members of the staff employed in the Ratnagiri Estate, Konney mentioned as party to the dispute require revision in accordance with the A. P. T. Circular No. 168 dated 5th May 1948 or on any other basis and if so, from what date ?

1. Sri Agastine S. Fernandez, Superintendent.
2. „ P. K. Nanoo, Office clerk.
3. „ K. Mathew, Head Conductor.
4. „ Mytheen Kannoo Rowther, Assistant Conductor.

Labour Department

L. Dis. 20333|56|DD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 27th August 1956.*

NOTIFICATION

WHEREAS Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute Exists between The Group Manager, The Valley End

Group Estate, Mundakayam and the workmen of the above Estate represented by the High Range Estate Employees Association, Mundakayam in respect of matters mentioneed in the annexure to this order,

AND WHEREAS the said dispute had been referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Trivandrum by Order L7-8204|54|DD dated 4-10-1954 and is pending adjudication,

AND WHEREAS since then an Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey has been constituted,

AND WHEREAS in the opinion of Government it is expedient to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication by the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey,

NOW THEREFORE in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the General Clauses Act (Central Act X of 1897) Government hereby withdraw the said Industrial Dispute from the Industrial Tribunal, Trivandrum and refer the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

1. Whether the discharge of the following 35 workers from the Valley End Group Estate is justifiable? If not to what relief or reliefs are they entitled to?

Workers discharged from Valley End Group Estates—Kuppakayam Division.

1. Raman of Velu Pillai Kangani.
2. Joseph do.
3. Rahael do.
4. Madhavan do.
5. Thomas of Velu Pillai Kangani.
6. Raghavan do.
7. Kanjukutty of Marikar Kangani.
8. Chellappan do.
9. Atchuthan do.
10. Poulose do.
11. Bhargavan do.
12. Mathew do.
13. Chandran do
14. Vasu do.
15. Kalyani do.
16. Krishnankutty do.
17. Podiyani of Authachetty do.
18. Mathai do.
19. Pylo do.

20. Kittan of Philipose Kangani
21. Chellappan do.
22. Pappachi do.
23. Philipose Kangani
24. Aiyappan do.
25. Sara do.
26. John do.
27. Bhaskaran do.
28. David Kangani of Estate Kangani.
29. Pappy do.
30. Kochu Ouseph do.

Chennappara Division.

31. Muhammed of Kunjikoya Kangani.
32. Kunju Mohammed of do.
33. Kunjammutty Kangani of Marikar Kangani.
34. Kunjahammad.

Mathamba Division.

35. Dani of Kunju Raman Kangani.

2. Whether the deduction of four days wages made as punishment for misconduct under the standing orders is liable to be cancelled.

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20950|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between THE MANAGEMENT OF THE TRAVANCORE OGALE GLASS MANUFACTURING Co. Ltd., UDYOGAMANDAL P. O., ALWAYE, and the workmen excluding the staff of the above concern represented by the Ogale Glass Factory Thozhilali Union, Udyogamandal P. O., Alwaye, in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. Joseph,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

(1) Should the present wage rates of the workers be revised; and if so, to what extent?
(2) Should the dearness allowance be enhanced and if so to what extent?
(3) To what quantum of bonus are the workmen entitled for the year 1954-55?
(4) Should August 15th, Union Day and Nibi Dinam be declared as festival holidays?
(5) Are the workmen entitled to any production bonus on the basis of the percentage of the first quality articles produced in the factory and if so, at what rate?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20256|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between Power Traction Company, Quilon and the workmen of the above concern represented by the Motor and Engineering Workers' Union, Ernakulam in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

(1) Has tractor driver P. U. John been unjustly denied batta from 13-4-1956? If so to what relief is he entitled?
(2) Has he been unjustly kept out of service from 7-5-1956? If so to what relief is he entitled?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20383|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between Sri M. K. T. Muthukrishna Pillai (Proprietor, Lekshmi Vilas Estate, Vandanmedu) Cardamom

Planter, Cumbum P. O., and the workmen of the above Estate represented by the Regional Secretary, The Estate Staffs Union of South India, Thayyil Buildings, Chetty St., Kottayam in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,
V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

Issues:

Whether the discharge of Sri K. P. Karunakaran Pillai, from the Lekshmi Vilas Estate (Vandanmedu) is justifiable? To what relief is he entitled if the discharge is (a) justifiable (b) not justifiable?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20948|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between The Manager, Sri Chithra Mill, Kalamassery, Alwaye and the workmen excluding the staff of the above concern represented by the Sri Chithra Mill Workers' Union, Kalamassery, Alwaye in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,
V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

To what quantum of bonus are the workmen entitled for the year 1955?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20380|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between Sri A. Narayanan Mooss, Licensee, The Kottayam Electric Supply Agency, Kottayam and his workmen represented by the General Secretary, The Kottayam Electric Supply Agency Workers' Union, Kottayam, in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,
V. V. Joseph,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

Issues for reference:

1. Are the employees of the Kottayam Electric Supply Agency entitled to the scales of pay and allowances paid for similar categories of employees in the State Government Electricity Department? If not, what should be their scales of pay and allowances? From which date should the new scales of pay etc. if any, be given effect to.
2. Should the employees of the Kottayam Electric Supply Agency be given the same leave facilities and holidays available for the employees of the State Government Electricity Department? If not, what should be their leave facilities and paid holidays?
3. Are the employees entitled to any additional bonus for the year 1130 M. E. over and above the bonus paid to them for the year concerned? If so what should be the additional bonus?
4. Should the executive staff and bill collectors be supplied with free rain coats?
5. Are the senior lascars entitled to promotion as line men?
6. Whether the existing rates of batta for the line men, Asst. line men and lascars are reasonable? If not, to what enhanced batta are they entitled?
7. Should the executive staffs and the peons be supplied with free uniforms and if so what should be their uniforms and how many sets of such uniforms be supplied in an year?

8. Whether workman P. R. Gopala Pillai is entitled to be reinstated in the service of the Kottayam Electric Supply Agency and if so from which date? What relief should be given to Gopala Pillai if he is not entitled to reinstatement?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20381|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between Manager, Tessy Industries, Palluruthy, Cochin 5 and the workmen of the above concern represented by Tessy Industrial Workers' Union, Palluruthy and the Tessy Thozhilali Union, Palluruthy, in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. Joseph,
Industries Secretary.

Annexure.

Issues to be referred:

1. Whether the managements of the Tessy Industries, Palluruthy are justified in retrenching the following workmen? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled?

    1. Louis, T. R.
    2. Michael
    3. N. R. Robert
    4. K. E. Peter
    5. Augustine
    6. U. T. John
    7. C. J. Xavier
    8. Paul Palackal
    9. Joseph Nedumparambil
    10. Augustine Kadepparambu
    11. C. V. Lonan
    12. Thankappan, N. N.
    13. Parameswaran, C. P.
    14. K. J. Solomon

15. V. P. Kumaran
16. P. V. George
17. K. J. Joseph
18. V. M. John
19. A. J. Cleatus
20. K. A. Chackochan
21. K. L. George
22. T. N. Prabhakaran
23. Joseph Palliparambil
24. C. A. John
25. P. E. John
26. P. T. Rajan
27. K. P. Raphael
28. R. C. Raghuvaran
29. C. L. Joseph
30. Hashel Korreya
31. P. C. Raghavan
32. O. K. Sankarankutty
33. Vasudevan, C. A.
34. T. R. Unni
35. C. J. Cheriyan
36. C. K. Damodaran
37. A. J. Sebastian
38. V. K. Joseph
39. N. X. Autho
40. P. P. Thankappan
41. A. S. Balan

2. Whether the discharge of workers Joseph Vattaparambu and K. T. Albert is justifiable? If not to what relief are they entitled?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 21763|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between The Caltex (India) Ltd., Ernakulam and the workmen of the above concern represented by the Patroleum Workers' Union, Ernakulam in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. Joseph,
Industries Secretary.

Annexure.

Issues:

1. Should there be a revision of the designation and grades of pay of the daily and the monthly paid workmen?
2. What special allowances, if any, are to be given to the several categories of the workmen?
3. What bonus if any are the workmen entitled to for the years 1953 and 1954?
4. Should there be any revision of the D. A. of the workmen and the clerical and allied staff?
5. To what leave and holidays are the workmen and the clerical and allied staff entitled annually?
6. What should be the rate of overtime allowance for workmen not covered by the Factories Act?
7. Should work on Saturdays be limited to 5 hours between 8 a. m. and 1 p. m.?
8. Should any meals batta be paid to workers for work during meal time?
9. Should dismissed driver Walsh be reinstated with back wages?
10. Should uniforms or any wearing apparel be given to any category of workmen?
11. Should travelling batta be given to employees in addition to travelling fare?
12. What relief, if any, should be given to workers employed for 4 gallon tin filling?
13. Should advance be given to workmen for festivals?
14. Should all temporary workers be made permanent? Should temporary workers employed for emergency work be paid like permanent workers?
15. Should Gratuity and Provident Fund benefits be extended to all workmen?
16. Should free tea be given to workmen?
17. Should the benefits awarded take effect from 1st January 1953?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 17807|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the Manager, Alagappa Textiles Ltd., Alagappanagar and the workmen of the above concern represented by the (1) The Alagappa Textile Workers' Congress, Alagappanagar, (2) The Textile Workers' Union, Amballur in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,
V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

Issues:

1. Are the workmen of the Alagappa Textiles Ltd., Alagappanagar, entitled to any bonus for the year 1955-56? If so what should be its quantum?
2. Whether the badli workers who are now working in the Mills are entitled to lay off compensation, as in the case of other workmen?

Labour Department

No. L.Dis. 21760|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between Sri K. A. Krishna Pillai, Contractor, Toddy Shop No. 25, Parapuzha, Thodupuzha and the workmen of the above shop represented by the Thodupuzha Taluk Chethu Thozhilali Union, Thodupuzha in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ernakulam.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,
V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

Issues:

1. Whether the non-employment of worker Kutten from 1-4-1956 justifiable or not? In either case to what reliefs is he entitled?

2. Whether the non-employment of the following workers from 1-6-1956 justifiable or not? In either case, to what reliefs are they entitled?

1. Raman Konni, Vilayalil Veedu, Parapuzha.
2. Pappu Padmanabhan, Punnackal Veedu, Kaloor.
3. Chenni Balan, Erappanal, Kaloor.
4. Achutan Chenni, Erappanal, Kaloor.
5. Narayanan Kela, Pukkunnal, Kodikulam.
6. Karampan Neelakantan, Chennamkode, Kodikulam.
7. Kunjan Velayudhan, Kollamparampil, Parapuzha.
8. Kunjappi Kutti, Vilayalil, Parapuzha.
9. Kumaran, Paramkara, Kodikulam.
10. Unniathi Narayanan, Kilikattuthottam, Kaloor.
11. Kanda Karunakaran, Varakukalayil, Kodikulam.
12. Kunjingan Makki, Kodukkal, Kaloor.
13. Kanda Raman, Kunnel, Kaloor.
14. Ithai Raman, Vilayalil, Parapuzha.
15. Krishnan Maki, Malaparambil, Kaloor.

3. Whether the above workers are entitled to any reliefs for the strike period from 10-4-1956 to 1-6-1956?

Labour Department

No. L. Dis. 20382|56|DD.

Dated, Trivandrum, 31st August 1956.

ORDER.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the Superintendent, Koliekanam Estate, Fairfield P. O., and the workmen of the above estate represented by the Highland Estate Workers' Union, Elappara, Peermade in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order,

And, whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said Industrial Dispute for adjudication,

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alleppey.

By order of His Highness
the Raj Pramukh,

V. V. JOSEPH,
Industries Secretary.

ANNEXURE.

Issues: Whether the dismissal of workman Arumugham from the Koliekanam Estate is justifiable? To what relief is he entitled in case the dismissal is (a) justifiable and (b) not justifiable?

Printed and Published by the S. G. P. at the Government Central Press,
Trivandrum, 1956.